

REMARKS

The drawings and specification were objected to because of use of the reference character "12". The specification has been amended on page 4, line 1 to identify the fat with reference character 10 consistent with use on page 3, line 13. FIG. 2 has similarly been amended to show reference character 10 as the fat and reference character 12 as the anhydrous potassium carbonate granules. FIGS. 1 and 2 are consistent as amended. A Replacement Sheet is enclosed herewith.

Claims 1-4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *Stringer et al.* Claims 5-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Stringer et al* in view of Armand Products Company handbook.

Claims 2 and 3 have been canceled herein without prejudice or disclaimer.

Stringer et al disclose a feed of farinaceous and proteinaceous ingredients, both of which are organic materials. Nowhere do *Stringer et al* suggest or disclose the use of inorganic feed. Further, *Stringer et al* disclose a coating comprised of an emulsified mixture of dextrin material and fat (column 1, line 65 to column 2, line 1; column 2, lines 15-29, 48-67). *Stringer et al* do not suggest nor disclose that the coating be only fat without being emulsified with dextrin material.

Amended claim 1 recites a hydrogenated fat coating found on an inorganic feed supplement. It is submitted that *Stringer et al* do not describe every element of the amended claim and lifting the 35 U.S.C. §102(b) basis of rejection is respectfully requested.

Armand discloses that potassium carbonate is used as a cattle feed but does not suggest nor disclose that the potassium carbonate be coated in any manner. It is submitted that there is no motivation for a person skilled in the art to combine *Stringer et al* and Armand. *Stringer et al* has

existed since 1978 and the Armand handbook was published on line in 2000. The coexistence over this period of time was not obvious to persons skilled in the art. Further, even if combined, the resultant feed would have a coating of fat and dextrin, not solely fat as claimed by the applicant. In a practical sense, the applicant's claimed feed supplement would be less costly than the product available from combining *Stringer et al* and Armand because of the need to emulsify the *Stringer et al* coating. Persons skilled in the art would have recognized this advantage if it were obvious as suggested by the Examiner.

It appears that all matters have been addressed satisfactorily, and that the case is now in condition for a complete allowance; and the same is respectfully urged.

However, if the Examiner has any comments or questions, or has any suggestions as per MPEP 707.07 (d) and (j), for putting the case in condition for final allowance, he is respectfully urged to contact the undersigned attorney-of-record at the telephone number below, so that an expeditious resolution may be effected and the case passed to issue promptly.

Respectfully submitted,

Sep 20, 2004
Date

Robert M. Gamson
Robert M. Gamson
Reg. No. 32,986
Attorney for Applicant

ARMSTRONG, KRATZ, QUINTOS,
HANSON & BROOKS, LLP
502 Washington Avenue, Suite 220
Towson, MD 21204
Telephone: (410) 337-2295
Facsimile: (410) 337-2296

RMG/chb
Enclosure

C:\Corel\Office9\WPWin9\Carolyn\amend\03178amd.wpd

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMITTAL

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service as Express Mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Date: September 20, 2004

Express Mail Label No. EV455665434US

By: Carolyn H. Bates
Carolyn H. Bates